

REMARKS

In light of the following remarks and above amendments, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 USC §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Claims 17-20, and amended claims 1-16 are in this application.

At paragraph 1 of the outstanding Office Action of May 8, 2003, the Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mazaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,124,913) in further view of Tsujikawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,320,628) and Gunning et al. (EP 0622656). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Amended independent claim 1, recites in part, "A liquid crystal display projector apparatus...**wherein a rotational angle position of said optical compensator is selected so as to provide the best contrast and uniformity of an image displayed by said projector before being fixed to said liquid crystal panel and said analyzer.**" (Underlining and Bold added for emphasis.)

It is respectfully submitted that the above-mentioned references relied upon by the Examiner do not teach the above-recited feature added to independent claims 1, 6 and 10. The Examiner admits that Mazaki does not disclose (i) a microlens array for focusing incoming light

onto the display pixels and (ii) forming an optical compensation film at an angle to the surface of the liquid crystal panel. The Examiner relies on Tsujikawa and Gunning, respectively, to teach features (i) and (ii) not disclosed by Mazaki. With respect to the Tsujikawa reference, as seen in figure 3, there is no optical compensator located between elements 8 and 9 which depict the liquid crystal element and the analyzer, respectively. Amended independent claim 1 specifically states that the optical compensator for compensating for an optical phase difference is located between the liquid crystal panel or element and the analyzer on a light exit side of the liquid crystal panel. Indeed, Tsujikawa is not concerned with phase compensation at the light exit side of the projection type liquid crystal display apparatus. With respect to Gunning, nowhere in the specification does it teach selecting a rotational angle position of an optical compensator to provide the best contrast and uniformity of an image displayed by said projector before being fixed to said liquid crystal panel and said analyzer. Gunning uses the optical compensating elements without selecting a rotational angle position of the compensating elements beforehand to correct for unwanted angular effects. Indeed, Gunning is not concerned with rotational angle positions of compensators to correct the uniformity of an image. Therefore, amended independent claim 1 is believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Mazaki, Tsujikawa and Gunning for at least the reasons stated above.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to amended independent claim 1, withdrawal of the rejection to amended independent claims 6 and 10 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5, 7-9 and 11-15 are dependent from one of amended independent claims 1, 6 and 10 and, due to such dependency are also believed to be distinguishable from the

applied combination of Mazaki, Tsujikawa and Gunning for the same reasons as amended independent claims 1, 6 and 10.

Applicants therefore respectfully request the rejection of claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

At paragraph 2 of the outstanding Office Action of May 8, 2003, the Examiner stated that claims 16-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's comments that dependent claims 16-20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants submit that claim 16 has been rewritten in independent form as suggested by the Examiner. Further, claims 17-20 depend either directly or indirectly from amended independent claim 16 and, due to such dependency, are also believed to be allowable. Therefore, claims 16-20 are believed to be allowable.

This is in response to the Examiner's statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter, included at paragraph 2 of the present Office Action. To the extent the Examiner's statement states, implies or is construed to mean that the claims are allowable over the prior art of record because the Examiner believes the claims should be interpreted to include one or more features or limitations not recited therein, Applicants' attorney disagrees with such an interpretation. Moreover, it is Applicants' contention that there is no particular limitation in the allowed claims that is more critical than any other. The issuance of the Examiner's statement should not be construed as a surrender by Applicants of any subject matter. It is the intent of Applicants, by their attorney, to construe the allowed claims so as to cover the invention disclosed in the instant application and all equivalents to which the claimed invention is entitled.

The Examiner has made of record, but not applied, several U.S. patents. The Applicants appreciate the Examiner's explicit finding that these references, whether considered alone or in combination with others, do not render the claims of the present application unpatentable.

It is to be appreciated that the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art represent the present opinions of the applicants undersigned attorney and, in the event, that the Examiner disagrees with any such opinions, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where in the reference or references, there is the bases for a contrary view.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By



Gordon Kessler
Reg. No. 38,511
(212) 588-0800